



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In fact, our history teaching is little else than the details of politics and statecraft, the most complex part of our life and the part hardest for young people to understand. We have required that our State and national constitutions be taught in the schools, but we have not yet been wise enough to enact a law which will require our children to be taught something of the real history of the family, the school, the church, and industry—the institutions upon which the State depends for its stability. We fill the minds of our young children with the details of the lives of warriors and of campaigns and of quarrels over tariffs and taxes, while they grow up ignorant of the real meaning of the life in which they must live and play a part.

Fifth, the schools should teach the wars of history so as to emphasize their causes, their results, their spirit and method, their destructive effects in disorganizing industry, in adding to the cost of living, their waste of wealth, their awful destruction of human life.

Sixth, the schools should emphasize the lives and the work of the constructive men and women of the world—such men as Horace Mann, John Howard, and William Penn; such women as Florence Nightingale, Frances Willard, and Dorothea Dix. The schools should emphasize the work of the heroes and heroines of everyday life—the mothers who go down to death that we may live; the mothers who toil long hours that their children may go to school; the doctors who face death that they may relieve suffering and lessen the spread of contagion; the teachers and preachers like Calvin, Wiley, Nereus Mendenhall, Joseph Caldwell, Asbury, Roger Williams, George Fox, and thousands of others who live among us today, in order that higher ideals of family, church, school, and industry may be passed on to coming generations.

Seventh, the schools should cease to be the vehicles to transmit race hatreds, international prejudices, and outworn superstitions. Many of our school-books are filled with such matters. Our plain duty is to refuse to be even the most innocent means of lodging in the minds of young children prejudices against England, the North, or against any people. Above and higher than any nation is humanity. Christ said that God is your Father and all ye are brethren.

Eighth, the schools must teach less of the spectacular patriotism, which consists largely of gyrations and genuflections before the flag, in vain boastings and inane declarations about loyalty to a section. Service to country, to God, to humanity is patriotism, and not mere pride in our physical resources. Surely it is as holy a thing to swear allegiance to the battle against tuberculosis, which kills ten times as many people each year as have been killed in all our foreign wars in the 126 years of our national existence, as it is to swear allegiance to any flag and to sing war songs around it.

Ninth, we should combat the maxim that "in time of peace we should prepare for war" with the more sensible doctrine that "in time of peace we should prepare for peace!" War is no more necessary than common murder, the trial by battle, duelling, or any other form of murder or man-killing. Nations as well as men can settle their differences without war. The ordinary citizen who makes of his home or his body an arsenal filled with weapons of destruction would not be believed if he asserted that his conduct was based on his great de-

sire to keep the peace. Modern nations which profess to desire peace, and yet make of themselves vast fortresses filled with all manner of destructive war implements, are blatant hypocrites.

Finally, the last few years have removed many of the physical barriers which have kept men and nations apart. The discoveries of science, wireless telegraphy, and other means of communication are constantly breaking down what were once thought insuperable barriers to trade and commerce between men in every part of the globe. It would be an anomaly if the twentieth century did not also see the breaking down of those spiritual barriers which have separated men in the past—race prejudice, national vanity, selfishness, and inordinate greed. To fight these spiritual enemies of world peace and good-will, the schools have a peculiar duty. They stand at the very threshold of the problem. My hope is that they will undertake their duty and grandly realize it.

WILSON, N. C.

The Panama Tolls Controversy.

The following statement was issued from the office of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C., on March 15, signed by twenty-two of the trustees:

The undersigned, members of the board of trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, invite the attention of their fellow-citizens to the following statement concerning the grave international discussion which has arisen over the exemption of American coastwise vessels from tolls on the Panama Canal:

On November 18, 1901, a treaty "to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans" was concluded between the United States and Great Britain, at the request and on the initiative of the United States. The essential provisions of the treaty were (1) that "the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States," and that "the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal"; (2) that "the canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality"; (3) that the plant for operating the canal and the canal itself shall be "neutralized," and shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents; (4) that the United States shall be at liberty to maintain an adequate military police along the canal; and (5) that "no change of territorial sovereignty or of the international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned canal shall affect the general principle of neutralization or the obligation of the high contracting parties under the present treaty."

The concluding of this treaty—commonly spoken of as the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty—was a necessary preliminary to the construction of any Isthmian canal by the United States or under its auspices; because by a previous convention between the same parties concluded in April, 1850, the United States and Great Britain had

bound themselves that neither would "ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over" an Isthmian canal or "maintain any fortifications commanding the same," or exercise dominion over "any part of Central America." The contracting parties further agreed to protect the canal from "interruption, seizure, or unjust confiscation," and to guarantee its neutrality.

This convention—commonly spoken of as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty—made at the request and on the initiative of the United States, established the general principle of the neutralization of any Isthmian canal which might be constructed, a principle which the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty reaffirmed.

The great design of both treaties, that of 1850 and that of 1901, was to promote the construction and maintenance of a ship-canal between the two oceans, for "the benefit of mankind, on equal terms to all," and to protect the neutralized canal effectively when built. In urging on the British government the making of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, the American negotiator said to Lord Palmerston: "The United States sought no exclusive privilege or preferential right of any kind in regard to the proposed communication [that is, a canal or railroad], and their sincere wish, if it should be found practicable, was to see it dedicated to the common use of all nations on the most liberal terms and a footing of perfect equality for all. That the United States would not, if they could, obtain any exclusive right or privilege in a great highway which naturally belonged to all mankind." This statement expresses accurately the avowed intention and resolve of the United States from 1850 to 1912 concerning any Panama Canal. All treaties on the subject are based on this intention and resolve, many times reiterated by official representatives of the American Government.

In the summer of 1912 Congress passed a bill fixing the tolls to be paid for passing through the Panama Canal—constructed by the United States and approaching completion—but added a section which exempted American coastwise vessels from paying tolls, thus giving American coasting vessels a privilege which no other vessels would enjoy, and diminishing the probable income of the canal in operation.

After an interval of several months, Great Britain has presented to the Government of the United States a protest against the exemption of American coastwise vessels on two principal grounds: First, that such an exemption is inconsistent with the provision of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty that the canal shall be open to vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality; and, secondly, that the exemption of American coastwise vessels would inevitably tend to increase the charges on all other vessels using the canal, to the disadvantage of all other nations in comparison with the United States, a disadvantage which might increase in the future, since the higher the rates the greater would be the privilege of exemption from paying them.

The British arguments are calm and free from exaggeration, and prove that the action of Congress in exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of canal tolls involves a construction of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty which is fairly open to question. A difference has arisen concerning the interpretation of a treaty.

On the 4th of April, 1908, the United States and

Great Britain made another treaty in which they agreed that "differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the Convention of the 29th of July, 1899, provided, nevertheless, that they do not affect the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the two contracting States, and do not concern the interests of third parties." The question whether American coastwise vessels shall pay tolls for passing through the canal cannot possibly be said to affect either nation's vital interests or independence, or the "honor" of either of the two governments. Clearly, a difference relating to the interpretation of a treaty has arisen between two governments which have agreed to submit such differences to The Hague Court of Arbitration.

In a special sense the United States is bound to observe faithfully and without question the treaty of April, 1908; for the United States has been among governments the great advocate of arbitration, has practiced it in important cases, and has urged it strongly on all other governments. The United States cannot refuse to arbitrate the difference which has arisen concerning the proper interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, without turning its back on a very honorable chapter in its own history, and damaging throughout the world the cause of free institutions. The Republic ought to be the most scrupulous of all governments in the exact observance of treaty obligations. It must be absolutely faithful to its word, even to its own hurt.

Assuming that the difference which has arisen concerning the construction of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty must be arbitrated unless the cause of the difference can be withdrawn, we desire to urge on our fellow-citizens the expediency of promptly repealing that action of Congress which gave rise to the difficulty.

Granting that some American shipping interests might be benefited by the exemption of coastwise vessels from canal tolls, since the term coastwise now includes voyages half round the globe, America surely has much larger interests which would be greatly served by the prompt abandonment of any interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty against which Great Britain can enter a reasonable protest. The United States has an immense interest in the sanctity of contracts, and in the strict observance of all international conventions and treaties. It has an immense interest in the faithful observance of any treaty between two or more nations which has been entered into "for the benefit of mankind." It is true that in times past many treaties have not been strictly observed; that others have been suffered to lapse quietly; and that some have been violated by one or more of the parties, too impatient to wait for a new convention. Despotic and monarchical governments have often sinned in these respects, and republics have been accused of like conduct. All the more the reason that the American Republic should do no act under a treaty which can be even questioned by candid and honorable men. In the efficacy of international agreements lies the chief hope of the world for progressive civilization.

The further promotion, in a method of uncertain

value, of the interests of American coastwise shipping, interests already protected by the possession of a complete monopoly as against all other nations, is a doubtful matter of commercial improvement. The whole country considered, the pecuniary advantage would not be large, and might easily be completely offset by accompanying disadvantages; but whatever advantage might come to this well-protected industry, it would be as nothing compared with the interests of the whole United States in carrying out the noble work of building a canal between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans for the common advantage of all nations.

The greatest interest of the United States as a free nation is to represent worthily before the world the principles of civil and religious liberty and the public efficiency and well-being which those principles develop, and thereby to promote the adoption of these principles the world over. This is a great material as well as a great moral interest. In comparison with this large interest, the interest of the United States in its coastwise vessels sinks into insignificance. By securing the repeal of that part of the act of Congress on the Panama Canal which provided for the exemption of American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, the American people would embrace a precious opportunity to prove that they understand their highest interest, and recognize their duty to promote it "for the benefit of mankind."

JOSEPH H. CHOATE.
ANDREW D. WHITE.
CHARLES W. ELIOT.
JOHN L. CADWALADER.
ELIHU ROOT.
LUKE E. WRIGHT.
CHARLEMAGNE TOWER.
R. S. WOODWARD.
AUSTEN G. FOX.
J. G. SCHMIDLAPP.
ROBERT S. BROOKINGS.

OSCAR S. STRAUS.
SAMUEL MATHER.
JAMES L. SLAYDEN.
CHARLES L. TAYLOR.
HENRY S. PRITCHETT.
WILLIAM M. HOWARD.
CLEVELAND H. DODGE.
ROBERT A. FRANKS.
NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.
ARTHUR WILLIAM FOSTER.
JAMES BROWN SCOTT.

Sulgrave Manor, a Shrine of British-American Peace.

By James L. Tryon, Director of the New England Department of the American Peace Society.

It has been proposed by the British Committee on the Centenary of Peace that Sulgrave Manor, the home of the ancestors of George Washington in England, be bought and made a shrine of pilgrimage for the English-speaking peoples. I had seen old prints of Sulgrave, but the proposition to buy it prompted me, while I was abroad last summer, to see the place for myself and consider the merits of the proposal for its purchase.

Sulgrave Manor is situated near Helmdon, a small village on the Great Central Railway, in Northamptonshire, about two hours' ride from London. The drive from the little country station is rather pretty, as you pass through rolling hay-fields, partitioned by hedges, plentifully marked with trees. Sulgrave is a straggling hamlet, accentuated by the bare Norman tower of a village church.

The house of the Washingtons is a plain white stone building, with a tile roof. The side of it that you see on your approach looks familiar enough to you if you

have seen pictures of the manor; but the garden side is a new view. A low door opens into the garden, and shows a vista through the house into a courtyard, with a row of farm buildings in the distance.

At first sight the buildings looked merely old and gray, but on making acquaintances with them, by a stay over night, I found them to be on the verge of decay. At considerable expense, however, they may be restored to their former condition of simple grandeur. Already the work of time and the weather have begun to tell upon the Washington and the royal coats-of-arms that may be seen in the gable of the porch, but these have been encased in glass for protection.

The rooms of the house contain none of the Washington furniture. That must have disappeared generations ago, when the estate went out of the hands of the family. Nor is there anything about the present furnishings that impresses you as historic. The manor house is now used as a farm-house and its furniture is of a kind suitable for a farmer's use. The kitchen is the quaintest room in it. There you will see a curious combination of open fire-place, oven, great home-cured hams on hooks above your head, and a strange collection of kitchen utensils, a saddle, a bucket or two, and other articles suspended from the ceiling or hanging on the walls. A table and some chairs, at which the family sit at meals, make up the essential characteristics of a domestic scene.

At night, when callers, who were relatives of the family, came from the village, bringing with them hearty greetings to the American guests of the occasion, greetings the more hearty because these people of Sulgrave had kindred on this side of the water, the room lost its fantastic appearance, and in its atmosphere of sociability seemed like an old-fashioned fireside at home.

The most cheerful corner in the house is the front living room of former generations. They, perhaps having less work to do, had more leisure to enjoy the manor than the present occupants can find. During my visit this room was occupied by paying guests, of whom there are generally one or two in the summer. This room is large and high-posted. Black beams that have been stained in recent years project from under the ceiling. There is a black fire-place that was once probably large enough for burning great logs. There is an ample window-seat, where you would like to sit and read of mediæval England or look out upon the field and dream. The window-seat and fire-place are among the few features which suggest that old-time elegance which the American pilgrim who knows beautiful Mount Vernon naturally anticipates.

In this room there hangs a large portrait of Washington, which was presented in trust to the mayor and town clerk of Banbury in 1909 by the Empire State Society, Sons of the American Revolution in New York. There are also hanging on the walls smaller pictures of George and Martha Washington, of Mount Vernon, and of Sulgrave Manor, the latter being a copy of a painting that was made for an American a few years ago. I found that the hostess of the manor kept up correspondence with several of her past American visitors, one of whom had expressed the hope the manor might be bought and restored by Americans.

While I was at Sulgrave I visited the church, and found there a tablet to Laurence and Amy Washington, the first of that name to own the manor.